1858 The Daily Colonist. 1959

"An Independent Newspaper, The Organ of No Clique or Party"

SETH HALTON, Publisher SANDHAM GRAVES, Editor-in-Chief

Published every morning except Monday by the Colonist Publishers Ltd. at 2631 Douglas Street, Victoria, B.C.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1959

Is This Necessary?

AT a time when B.C. Power Commission administration is being investigated by a royal commission appointed by the provincial government, it is somewhat disturbing to find the same government introducing legislation to expand the same administrative set-up. The investigating body has not finished its examination. Is it necessary or supportable therefore for the government thus prematurely to provide for a commission of five in place of the present three members without waiting to see what the royal commission has to say?

What conditions or future plans prompt the government to the conclusion that responsibilities devolving on the policy-making board are too weighty to be discharged by three commissioners? These men do not, or should not, function on the "doing" level. Below them for that is a large and steadily increasing staff of highly paid and highly experienced experts—a chief engineer with a staff of qualified engineers, a general manager, a production manager and so forth throughout the various phases of operation and administration.

In the formulation of policy and planning it is difficult to see what could be accomplished better by the deliberations of five commissioners than by three. Hitherto the commission has functioned with an engineer as chairman, a lawyer as legal member and a third commissioner of experience in finance and administration. What further division of responsibility is necessary? On top of this permanent organization, when large-scale projects are in train the commission has engaged the services of one of Canada's leading firms of consulting engineers, and also employs those of a local firm of accountants. Even allowing for the scope of its operations the BCPC already is a very large—and many people believe topheavy—organization.

Because of a resignation the commission at present consists of only two members. Due to impending retirements the turn-over soon will be complete. It is highly probable that the royal commission will have recommendations to make as to numerical strength of the commission commensurate with its duties. Surely it is jumping the gun for the government to ask the legislature at this juncture to sanction enlargement.

Some Dynamism Is Awaited

DEAN ANDREW of UBC says Victoria College is well on the way to university status as a four-year liberal arts centre, which is pleasing assurance even if it seems that steps towards this attainment have bogged down. Certainly little of a positive nature has been done of late, much to the discouragement of those local groups which have pursued this subject with commendable enthusiasm.

Dean Andrew indicates that enlargement of the College has UBC's blessing, and that the cornerstone of a new system of higher education will be the Point Grey and Victoria institutions. What is a corollary of course are the physical appurtenances to implement such elevation of Victoria College, and it is here that a hiatus seems to have intervened. A first and most desirable step would be to acquire the vacant Gordon Head property for a new campus, and the dickering in private going on between Judge Clearihue, chairman of the college council, and federal authorities apparently has brought small result. There is suspicion of buck-passing by the defence and works departments when the ministers concerned, both B.C. MPs, should be making it easy to arrange a transfer at a favorable price.

If all the ends could be tied up Victoria College would indeed be well on its way to the projected status. As Dean Andrew pointed out, a $300,000 matching grant is available from the Canada Council once the college council does its part by public or other subscription. More than once, also, Premier Bennett has indicated financial support by the government provided the necessary land is secured and other steps are taken which indicate council and community responsibility. What is awaited now is a definite policy declaration by the college council. It must give the lead, but it will find ample backing if it produces the required dynamism of purpose.

One trusts therefore that an outline of the proposed development will be given next week when opening extension ceremonies are held at the College. Particularly should the situation be made clear with regard to the acquisition of the Gordon Head property, for on this probably depends the future of Victoria College along the lines envisaged by Dean Andrew and much wanted by this area.

Tragedy in Storm

MARINE and waterfront circles in Victoria yesterday expressed their sympathy in the sudden loss of the Port Angeles tug Henry Foss, which foundered with a loss of six lives after striking a rock off the southeast point of Salt Spring Island at 4 a.m. yesterday during the overnight gale. Under the tragic circumstances at the scene, there was no report of sinking for some hours, until the tugboat's overturned lifeboat was seen by the crew of the ferry Cy Peck shortly after clearing Ganges on the first run of the day.

The Cy Peck altered course immediately and picked up the sole survivor, who was at the point of exhaustion from exposure. A second crewman was lifted from the water, but died before reaching hospital. Five others on board the Henry Foss are believed to have drowned when the intense cold numbed them and one by one they let go their holds on the capsized small boat. The tug, badly holed some hours before, apparently went down immediately.

Once reported, the mishap set in motion full air-sea rescue efforts on the Canadian side. RCAF patrols searched the disaster area. The RCMP got a patrol launch on the scene. A number of bodies were recovered. The late warning, however, proved too much of a handicap against lessening the toll of the tragic mishap. The sinking of the Henry Foss occurred during a 70-knot wind in pitch darkness.

On many occasions in the past when Canadian vessels have been in peril the United States Coast Guard Service has rendered invaluable help, and often has been first at the scene. In this instance, although every Canadian effort was expended, the tragic circumstances prevented a happier result. The earnest sympathy of this port will go to those who have been so sadly bereaved.

Interpreting the News

Diplomacy Wins Point

By JOSEPH MacSWEEN
Canadian Press Staff Writer

THE Zurich "summit" plan for an independent Cyprus follows months of patient behind-the-scenes diplomatic work.

The compromise agreement between Prime Minister Constantine Karamanlis of Greece and Adnan Menderes of Turkey, so simple on the surface, also follows four years of bitter strife.

Britain still must approve the terms of the new constitution for her Mediterranean island colony, but this is believed to be assured. Britain has insisted that there should be no change without Greek-Turkish accord.

Under the agreement, Cypriot independence would be guaranteed by troops of all three countries in the dispute—Britain, Greece and Turkey—and a strategic base would remain safe for NATO.

There are still dangers to be faced. Extremists among Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots may not be satisfied with a proposed constitution which would impose a permanent ban on the island joining Greece or Turkey.

But observers see in the Zurich agreement the best chance for peace since the Cyprus troubles began in April, 1955, with a Greek Cypriot movement named EOKA calling for an end of British control and demanding union with Greece.

* * *

Violence long raged between members of the Greek community, which totals 400,000, and the Turkish community, 100,000. Turkish-Cypriots demanded partition of the island, while the Greek Cypriots called for union with Greece and later independence.

It is against this background that the Zurich agreement has been reached after two months of quiet diplomacy.

Exclusive Location

'Strike Fighter'

The Arrow For NATO?

By LEROY POPE
United Press International

NEW YORK—One of the mysteries in the controversy over the Avro Arrow CF-105 fighter plane is this: "Why doesn't Canada use it to re-equip her own air division in Europe?"

U.S. experts say Canada has an obligation to NATO to provide new and more advanced planes for this division but seems reluctant to use the Arrow unless the United States will buy it for other NTAO members.

The Americans and some of the other NATO countries are giving preference to the still unevaluated "strike fighter" designed by the Italian Fiat Company. But experts in Washington and at NATO headquarters in Paris have said privately that the Canadians could use the Arrow as a strike fighter in their own division and that such a move would be helpful to NATO.

It has also been suggested to Washington that the Arrow could be used as an anti-submarine torpedo bomber.

* * *

At present, Canada's air division in Europe has four squadrons of Avro CF-100s and eight squadrons of Canadair-Orenda F-86E Sabres. The Sabres are counter-fighters and the CF-100s are strategic interceptors equipped with radar and air-to-air missiles—to be used against enemy heavy bombers.

Counter-fighters may be obsolete—to be replaced by missiles. That would eliminate the Sabres — and the Arrow would be more effective than the CF-100s as strategic interceptors.

Also, by using the Arrow for its NATO air division, Canada presumably could reduce the unit production cost of the plane somewhat. That would make it more feasible to continue building the Arrow for its defence mission in Canada during the years until new advanced chemical fighters like the American F-108 are available. By that time Canada might design a more advanced plane of her own.

* * *

Actually, the Diefenbaker government's reasons for not having proposed up to now to use the Arrow in Europe may not be so mysterious after all. Neither the Arrow nor the Fiat-designed plane is the ideal "strike fighter" for Europe.

No such plane exists.

The ideal "strike fighter" for NATO would be a revolutionary craft indeed—able to take off almost straight up, yet able to carry nuclear weapons behind enemy lines; and it should be able to fight other aircraft too.

The "almost straight up" take-off is the most important requirement—so that it could be used from tiny, easy-to-hide airfields hard for the enemy to wipe out.

It is probably the knowledge that the real need is for such an advanced plane—as yet not even on the drawing boards—that makes the Canadian government shrink from the expense of re-equipping Canada's NATO air division with the Arrow—even though it would be a considerable improvement over the division's present planes and would continue jobs for many Canadians.

There's another angle to the problem. That is—what is going to be the future role in NATO of the Canadian air division: strategic or tactical? So far the Canadian squadrons have been assigned to the strategic role. But there seems to be doubt about whether they will continue in that role.

Gerald Waring

Reports from Ottawa

THE House of Commons should have a permanent speaker. Prime Minister Diefenbaker said it. Former Speaker Rene Beaudoin said it.

And just the other day, Speaker Roland Michener said it.

Diefenbaker made it one of his election promises in the 1957 campaign. He then had plans "to restore Parliament to something of its former greatness," and one of them was appointment of a permanent speaker in the British tradition. Thus, he said, the Commons' presiding officer would be removed from the influences of partisan politcs.

The idea has been kicked about the Commons for decades. Many have argued for it, few against it. But no government has seen fit to alter the tradition of installing a new speaker for each Parliament, Alternating between English-Canadians and French Canadians.

My theory is that the first permanent speaker may already be in the chair; that this election promise may already be in the process of being carried out with no one but Diefenbaker yet being aware of it.

* * *

Michener was the speaker of the short-lived 23rd Parliament, between the 1957 and 1958 elections. He was re-elected to serve as speaker of this Parliament, his nomination being moved by Diefenbaker and seconded by Liberal leader Pearson.

One of Michener's predecessors, Mr. Speaker Lemieux, presided over three consecutive parliaments in the 1920s. By the time Michener equals the record of this distinguished French-Canadian, or about 1966, he could be such a fixture that the Commoners would unanimously desire him to continue occupying the chair.

Thus could a new tradition grow and an old promise be fulfilled. And all without controversy, or injury to the feelings of French-Canada, or damage to Tory Party support, that blunt and forthright action to carry out the 1957 promise could produce.

This is conceding that the Conservatives will win the next election, which doesn't seem too improbable, and assuming that even if the Liberals were to win in 1966 they would be happy to further the new tradition with a speaker of Michener's calibre.

Diefenbaker may have hinted at all this when he said last year that the question of a permanent speaker would be decided by "circumstances that develop through the crucible of history."

* * *

Michener himself provided the most cogent argument for a permanent speaker when he revealed to interviewer Peter Stursberg the secret dread of every speaker trying to render imparital judgments.

It is that in situations of great political import he may be called upon to rule against those who hold his political future in their hands.

The speaker is an MP of the party in power. What happens to him after his term of office depends on the prime minister he may have to overrule from the chair. In the past, speakers have moved from the chair to a cabinet portfolio. But an offended prime minister could easily let a former speaker sink into political oblivion on one of the back benches.

The spectre of Speaker Beaudoin still haunts the House of Commons. If Beaudoin ruled wrongly during the pipeline debate because of political pressure or concern for his own political future, then the Commoners should need no greater spur than his tarnished memory to prompt them to remove the chair from politics.

The Packsack

Of GREGORY CLARK

THE easiest thing in the world is to be crabby. Think of the trouble you avoid by being a crank. A sourpuss discourages maybe fifty to a hundred people a day from speaking to him, let alone asking him a favor, or for a little help.

It takes no energy to be a grouch. Most of us wake up grouchy in the morning. All we have to do, therefore, is to nurse our sulks for a matter of ten to fifteen hours, and we can return to bed as sullen as we left it.

Ill humor is effortless. And besides, it is protective. It saves us no end of work. Think of how much harder a good-natured person has to work in an eight-hour day. Consider how many of his fellow-worker's burdens he has assumed, with a smile. Think how costly those smiles are. They invite imposition.

But a good scowl keeps people at their distance.

"I figure," said a senior civil servant to me the other day, "that good-natured people do half as much work again as ill-natured people. I have no control over the people who are sent to work for me. Except this: the crabs get wonderful recommendations from me—to be promoted elsewhere!"

He has a flourishing and efficient department.

All happy.

Fun, Fact and Fiction

United States broadcasters are reported to be standing firm against use of TV for liquor advertising; and a good thing, too. We hate to think of commercials showing in cross-section how Old Busthead gets into the bloodstream twice as fast as any other leading brand.

* * *

"My wife is a remarkable cook," said the city man. "She's always trying out some new recipe. Yesterday she met a friend who had lived in the East and gave her a recipe for Chinese trifle. So she made it."

"What did it taste like?"

"Rice pudding."

* * *

The scene in the film was a tense one. The audience sat enthralled. Suddenly the hero slapped the heroine in the face, hard.

In the stunned silence that followed, a young voice piped up: "Mummy, why doesn't she hit him back like you do?"

Washington Angle

Russia's Wilful Lie

By DAVID LAWRENCE

THE United States government has again caught the Soviet government in a wilful lie about the murderous attack on 17 Americans travelling in an unarmed transport plane last September. Moscow now claims that the tape recording issued by the State Department here is a fake—but that's nonsense, and the Soviets know it. Consider these facts:

1. The Soviet government was offered last September 13 a chance to listen to the tape recording, but Ambassador Menshikov here refused and finally accepted only a typewritten copy of the transcript of the conversations between the Soviet flyers, telling how they were in the act of shooting down an American transport plane near the Turkish border. Why didn't the Soviets call it a fake before? They had three months to say so publicly — or privately — to the American government.

* * *

2. The officials of the United States government and their intelligence staffs knew full well that the question of authenticity might be raised, and so they checked and double-checked every angle. Also, the American plane was in communication with Western ground stations just a few minutes before the attack. The time and approximate location were established beforehand beyond question.

3. There is a monitoring system set up by the United States and its allies close to the Soviet border of Turkey and other Middle East boundaries, as well as in Western Europe and Canada. This vast electronic apparatus requires a big staff. Persons familiar with the Soviet languages monitor these listening posts along the Russian border, but highly trained American officers on the spot supervise the work as a part of the United States Air Force defence system.

4. Authentic transcripts of the chatter that goes on between Soviet airplanes are recorded daily—sometimes simultaneously from three or four different monitoring points. These are constantly checked against one another. The transcript of the episode which cost 17 American airmen their lives as the Soviet patrols shot down the unarmed transport plane was checked and double checked most carefully before being formally presented to the Soviet government last November. It was recorded by the same personnel whose recordings have been continuously checked—and proved in the past to be authentic.

* * *

5. The Soviet newspapers, by government direction, now criticize certain words in the translation issued by the State Department. It is true that some Russian words could be translated in various ways, such as "you boys" or "you fellows" or "you comrades." It's hard, sometimes, to translate the vernacular or idiomatic phrases. But if anyone has any doubts about the exact meaning of the original Russian script, let him listen to it. When the under-secretery of state, Robert Murphy, invited Ambassador Menshikov in Washington to listen to the tape recording and he refused, the same offer was made to the Russian embassy's air attache, but this also was declined.

6. Portions of the tape now have been played on the radio in this country in Russian, and will be repeated in international broadcasting so that anyone who understands the Russian language can make his own translation and decide for himself whether the basic facts of the transcript as issued by the department of state are in accord with what the voices on the tape itself say.

* * *

Officials here are astounded at the flatness of the Russian denial of the authenticity of the tape recording, and the only way they can figure it out at all is to assume that the Soviets, once having taken a position of complete innocence, do not dare now to change their minds.

The Soviets could have contended that the attack on the American plane was not ordered by Moscow—for, obviously, there wasn't time to get such orders to their own planes—and that the Soviet patrol mistakenly acted on general orders to shoot down what it might have thought to be armed planes. This could have explained what happened, but it cannot now explain the reason for the lying.

For the Soviet government has done itself irreparable harm throughout the world as it is caught in the act of telling falsehoods to the United States government in a matter involving the lives of 17 American citizens and their anxious relatives.

There is also a suggestion of Soviet trickery in the luring of the American plane across the border into Russia. The State Department's announcement about the Menshikov-Murphy conference of Nov. 13 was carefully worded on this point as follows:

"Mr. Murphy reviewed the facts of the case and informed the ambassador that it appeared to the United States government that the American pilot, as a result of the signals transmitted by radio beacons in Soviet Georgia and Armenia, had probably made a navigational error which resulted in his unintentionally crossing the Soviet border."